UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

What Constitutes an American? - *Harold L. Ickes*

The Twenty-Fifth Atlanta Conference - - - - - - - - *W. E. B. DuBois*

A New Dedication to National Unity - - - - - - - - *Albert C. Dieffenbach*

The Youth Odyssey - - - *Ruth Shirley*

Enough of Defense Talk! - *Dorothy Bushnell Cole*

"The Forbidden Theme" - *Karl M. Chworowsky*

VOLUME CXXVII NUMBER 9

Chicago, November, 1941

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Monthly *Subscription $1.50*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, April 11, 1941, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Declaration

In this time of growing tension of opinion and intolerance of spirit, it is appropriate that UNITY should reaffirm its position as a journal of liberal opinion.

UNITY is interested in no political party or platform, is bound to no school of philosophy or theology, is the organ of no sect or denomination, and is the voice of no organized movement. Rather is UNITY dedicated to certain underlying principles, namely, freedom, fellowship, and character in religion. It seeks the fulfilment of certain ideals, namely, representative democracy, peace, brotherhood, the commonwealth of man which is the kingdom of God on earth.

In dedication to its principles and in pursuit of its ideals, UNITY maintains the rule of liberty. Its editors, editorial contributors, and correspondents speak with unfettered freedom the convictions of their own minds within the general framework of a journal of liberal opinion. The writers of articles, reviews, and poems present their own ideas, which may, at times, be at variance with those of the editors. UNITY would repress no utterance and control no argument that is competent and honest, for it is skeptical of conformity and averse to authority, which always tend to hamper individual liberty. It is happy in those diversities of gifts and ideas which are the glory of the one spirit.

In this period of trial and crisis, UNITY would unite anew its editors and readers in the service of *Character* which is the substance of religion, *Freedom* which is its life, and *Fellowship* which is its goal. Thus would we vindicate our country, our civilization, our culture, religious and lay, in a period when all alike are threatened with extinction.

Contents

EDITORIAL—
- Editorial—CURTIS W. REESE 139
- Editorial Comment—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 140
- Jottings—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 143

ARTICLES—
- What Constitutes an American?—HAROLD L. ICKES 143
- The Twenty-Fifth Atlanta Conference—W. E. B. DUBOIS 145
- A New Dedication to National Unity—ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH 147
- The Youth Odyssey—RUTH SHIRLEY 149
- Enough of Defense Talk!—DOROTHY BUSHNELL COLE 151
- "The Forbidden Theme"—KARL M. CHWOROWSKY 152

POETRY—
- Conscription—JEROME ALEXANDER 148

THE STUDY TABLE—
- Testing Ground of the Good Neighbor Policy—ROBERT MURRAY PRATT 154

CORRESPONDENCE—
- Mr. Collier to Mr. Reese—OLIVER B. COLLIER 155
- All Are Guilty—R. W. HARRISON 155
- Hitler Must Be Stopped—F. S. KINDER 155
- Dark Thoughts for Hitler—ROGER E. WARNER 156
- In Defense of Lindbergh—ELNORE T. GUEST 156

THE FIELD—
- Contributors 138
- Personals 138

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Contributors

Harold L. Ickes: Secretary of the Interior since 1933.

W. E. B. DuBois: Editor of the Atlanta University Studies of the Negro Problem, 1897-1911; director of publications of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and editor of the *Crisis*, 1910-1932; professor of sociology, Atlanta University since 1932.

Albert C. Dieffenbach: Formerly, editor *Christian Register*, Boston; and more recently, editor of the religious section of the *Boston Transcript*.

Jerome Alexander: Distinguished chemist and author.

Ruth Shirley: Graduate of the University of Texas, 1939; student in the Graduate Institute of International Studies, Geneva, Switzerland, 1939-1941; at one time special correspondent for the Paris Edition of the *New York Herald Tribune*.

Dorothy Bushnell Cole: Member of the Board of Directors of the Chicago Urban League, and of the Board of Abraham Lincoln Centre; active in the Fight for Freedom Committee.

Karl M. Chworowsky: Pastor of the Fourth Unitarian Congregational Church in Flatbush, New York; frequent contributor to various journals.

Robert Murray Pratt: Pastor of the First Unitarian Church of Quincy, Illinois, since 1936.

Personals

The Reverend Edwin T. Buehrer, recently pastor of the Fellowship Church, Orono, Maine, has been called to the pastorate of the Third Unitarian Church of Chicago, and will begin his services there on November 9.

Dr. Charles H. Lyttle, professor of church history in the Meadville Theological School, delivered the occasional sermon at the Fiftieth Anniversary of All Souls' Unitarian Church of Evanston, October 19.

Dr. Curtis W. Reese will deliver the address, November 16, on the occasion of the celebration of the Sixtieth Anniversary of the First Unitarian Society of Minneapolis.

The Reverend A. Powell Davies, of Summit, New Jersey, delivered the sermon, October 24, at the installation of the Reverend Edwin H. Wilson as pastor of the First Unitarian Society of Schenectady, New York.

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXVII NOVEMBER, 1941 No. 9

EDITORIAL

CURTIS W. REESE

In the midst of the current strife it is helpful to remember that from earliest time there has been a marked trend toward wider and wider human relationships,—due both to the gregarious inclinations of mankind and to the necessities of the social situation. Individual anarchy is largely mythical, both among primitive peoples and the primates from which man evolved. The general rule is that individuals form clans, clans grow into tribes, and tribes grow into federations.

Among the American Indians certain leagues of neighboring tribes took on a sort of national significance. The Iroquois, including some five tribes, had a federal council of forty-eight, decisions of which were made only on unanimous votes. In the early Greek and Roman social institutions, from which western government has sprung, larger units sometimes came about in connection with the spread of a religion, or the protection of a shrine. One of the most famous of such leagues was the Delphic, comprising twelve cities. Other examples of the process of inclusion are Egypt, Babylon, and Persia, where aggregations of former independent states came more or less under the sway of various conquerors. Especially in ancient Persia do we find a rather democratic imperialism, with the individual states possessing wide autonomy and religious freedom. The classic days of Rome afford an example of many nations dwelling together in peace under the reign of law,—each state with its distinctive culture, yet all contributing to the culture of the imperial capital. Here was a league of nations, stretching from Great Britain to India, and from Russia to Egypt. While the sanction of this league was force, and membership in it was compulsory, it nevertheless gave Roman law and justice to the world.

Close upon the heels of Roman imperialism came medieval theocracy,—a government claiming the direct fiat of God, knowing "neither Jew nor Greek, bond nor free." Following the breakdown of medieval theocracy, there came a period of nationalistic development which seemed to be the doom of universal government. But soon independent nations found that they could not live unto themselves alone. Artificial barriers made trade and travel difficult, hence confederations, alliances, and federations were formed. The North German Federation, the Swiss Federation, the Federation of the States of America, and, of course, the British Commonwealth of Nations are examples in point.

In every attempt at a larger grouping of peoples, commerce, finance, sovereignty, and sanctions have appeared as major problems. While these problems are still with us, the first two—commerce and finance—are becoming allies of federation, for commerce and finance cannot flourish in restricted fields. The latter two, sovereignty and sanctions, still present difficulties, but both are relative terms. Sovereignty may be limited or abandoned by treaty agreement, and, as for sanctions, we are coming to see that there is only one sure sanction and that is public intelligence.

Between the passing of the theocracy and the coming of the Hague Conferences, the nations learned many important lessons—chief among them that, while balance of powers may serve to reduce the number of wars, there is nevertheless a corresponding increase in the size and ferocity of wars. Hence in 1899, the Czar of Russia invited the powers to a conference on the limitation of armaments, in response to which twenty-six nations met at the Hague. The Conference was generally regarded as successful and a second one was expected soon. Due, however, to the Boer and the Russo-Japanese wars, it was not until 1907 that a second conference was held. This time the Hague saw assembled representatives from forty-four nations. A third conference was planned for 1915, but fulfillment was made impossible by the first World War.

By 1914 there had been developed an elaborate code of international law but unfortunately only a small part of it had to do with the procedure of peace, and the major portion, which had to do with the procedure of war, was unable to stand the strain of international hostilities. Since the first World War, three tremendously significant things have occurred: the formation of the League of Nations, the establishment of the permanent

World Court, and the signing of the Pact of Paris. Despite their weaknesses and certain undemocratic features, the League of Nations and the World Court were far-reaching steps in the direction of world organization—and, from the point of view of world peace, the Pact of Paris may still be regarded as prophetic.

Meanwhile, international unions of all sorts have been growing apace. They have to do with communication, transportation, economics, sanitation, press service, and scientific purposes. World organizations, having political as well as economic aims, are the various internationals representing the workers of the world. The International Telegraph Union and the Universal Postal Union are examples of world organizations, without which we could hardly get along today.

Thus do we move slowly toward a united world.

But before this exalted vision can be realized, we must build a deeper and wider patriotism; *i. e.*, a state of mind in which we become zealous for the rights of all peoples. Such a state of mind is prerequisite to any hopeful program for a world order. Without it, federations fall to pieces and sacred vows become scraps of paper.

The building of a world order, under-girded by a patriotism that encompasses humanity, is no easy task. Old ideas die hard. Hate and prejudice are difficult to overcome. Suspicion is well entrenched. Vested interests fear innovations. Insidious foes constantly attack freedom and fraternity.

But however difficult the way, we must continue to foster all sorts of international organizations,—scientific, humanitarian, governmental. All such are units of a new world order.

Even in the midst of war, we can plan the world of our dreams, and in persistent and intelligent ways gradually lay the foundations of a structure that will one day rise above the crumbling ruins of nations and empires,—a structure wherein shall dwell, in peace and security, the now scattered members of the family of man.

Editorial Comment

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

I

It is not often that one hears from Gandhi these days. The English censor sees to that! But now and again a statement gets through—and is promptly buried on the inside pages by our newspapers. Such a statement appeared in just this way on October 13th last, incidentally so badly garbled that it was difficult to know just what Gandhi had really said. But he was evidently pleading for a negotiated peace as between Germany and Britain. His "hope" was that "Britain and Germany would both become exhausted and come to terms with neither defeated." Which means that Gandhi is as wise a statesman in this war as Woodrow Wilson was in the last war when he advocated a "peace without victory." For America the Mahatma had some shrewd advice. "She should ask," he said, "what will happen to India, Asia, and African possessions. She should withdraw any help unless there are guaranties of human liberty. . . . America would lose nothing by making stipulations concerning her war help." There are no signs at present that any stipulations are being made. We are headed right straight toward a repetition of the 1917-18 experience when we gave the Allies our help without exacting any terms, and were promptly sold out at the peace table. As regards his own personal philosophy, Gandhi is as much a pacifist today as he ever was. "With the war drawing closer to India," writes the Associated Press correspondent, "Mr. Gandhi said that he personally would stick to his non-violence, which he said 'is a life policy with me.'" To one who knows Gandhi, it is amusing to think that a newspaper man should suspect any change in Gandhi's attitude on the question of war and peace. The Mahatma is not the type of man who is a good pacifist when war is far away, and then throws all his pacifism overboard when war draws close. He holds to his principles not because they are expedient and popular but because they are true, and it is elementary with him that to such principles he should himself be true. In the case of such a man, one does not have to ask "what does he think now?"! Like a star, his mind shines clear whatever the mists and storms that becloud the sky. Though Hitler were at the gates of Delhi, Gandhi would still stand fast in his "non-violence."

II

We seem to be living in a time when, in matters of belief and conduct, we are being reduced to what is called a choice between evils. The most conspicuous example of what I mean is this war. Everybody is agreed these days that war is evil. But Hitler is evil, too! Most people would probably insist that Hitler is a greater evil than war. In any case, so it is argued, we must either submit to Hitler, or fight him. It is a choice between evils. The same logic is now being applied to Russia. The Stalin regime is wicked, no doubt about that. But, thanks to Hitler's aggression, it is fighting the Nazis who are our enemies. This means that, in the interest of defeating the Nazis, we must give all the help we can to the Soviets. We must

do this not because we like Stalin more but because we like Hitler less. It's a choice, in other words, between evils. But when did the moral man ever consent to a choice of this kind? How long since have we been robbed of freedom, that we must be bound to the wheel of any such dilemma as this? What I detest about this acceptance of evil choices is its surrender to a fatalistic interpretation of life. We are asked to believe that man does not direct his will, determine his action, but moves at the dictation of evil circumstance. He does not decide for himself what he will do on the basis of right principle, but waits till the sordid conflicts of the world dictate what he must do. But the free man consents to no such choices as this! He refuses to be confined within the limits of any such immoral necessity. Years ago I remember hearing William Everett, son of Edward Everett, state how he had been told as a boy that of two evils he must choose the lesser, and how his mother retorted that of two evils he must choose neither. There spoke a noble woman, worthy of a greater age than ours which believed in the free suffrage of the spirit. Imagine Emerson, or Thoreau, or Theodore Parker accepting the humiliation of making a choice between evils! Gandhi in our time, in a crisis big with destiny, has pointed the way. Thus, challenged with the dilemma of fighting Britain in India, or surrendering to Britain, he declared that he would do neither. Instead of fighting, or surrendering, he would practise non-violent resistance. *A third way!* This way is always there if we are intelligent enough to see it and courageous enough to follow it. I am not going to fight Hitler, and certainly not going to surrender to him. I am not going to support either of two dictators, Hitler or Stalin. I have got another and better way!

III

There's a story in China of how to cook a frog. You first catch your frog, of course. Then you place him on the stove and apply only the very faintest ray of heat. Not enough to disturb the frog and make him jump away! Then you increase the heat, O, just a wee bit. So small a rise in the temperature that the frog will never dream that anything is happening. Then a little more heat, and a little more—and *a little more!* Until the frog at last is nicely cooked, and has never suspected for a moment what has been done to him. This Chinese legend must be known to President Roosevelt. At any rate, this is precisely the recipe that he has followed in getting the American people into the European war. These people are just as much opposed to entrance into the war as the frog was to being cooked. Had there been any sudden and drastic proposal of belligerency, the American people would have jumped away as quick and far as the frog had he felt any sharp degree of heat. But the President turned on only a little of his policy at a time—a degree here, a degree there—and now, without realizing what has happened to them at all, the people are done for. Looking back over the progress of the cooking, one can see when certain decisive moments were reached. The first change in the Neutrality Act, like the laying of the frog on the stove, was of course the beginning of it all. The passing of the first Lend-Lease Bill marked the difference between a live frog and a dead one. The present proposed change of the Neutrality Act (to be accomplished, probably, before this editorial is published!), which will in turn be followed by the repeal of the whole, proclaims that the frog is nicely done and is ready for eating. Never was there a slicker piece of work than this slow but sure dragging of the American people into the war by the Washington administration. No Chinese cook was ever more clever—or more successful. The President may well lick his chops at a job well done and a meal exquisitely prepared. But at this point our analogy fails. Once the frog is cooked, he's finished. But the people?—they're going to wake up some day. When that moment comes, we prophesy that Hyde Park will be a more comfortable place than the White House.

IV

Something over a hundred years ago there was a President of the United States whose administration was unhappy and confused, and was brought to defeat by vicious partisan attack. Retiring under a dreadful cloud of unpopularity and discredit, this President, John Quincy Adams, continued his public service of the nation, and in the last thirty years of his life achieved again a position of influence and trust which ranks him to this day as one of the great statesmen and leaders of this republic. I think of this as a kind of precedent, or parallel, of the present career of Herbert Hoover. When his administration fell under the impact of the great depression, for which it was in no way responsible, and beneath the bitterly unfair attacks of the office-hungry Democratic Party, Mr. Hoover stood on the lowest possible level of popular disfavor. He was made the scapegoat of the age. But he lost not heart. He continued his public leadership. And now, in his ceaseless humanitarian endeavors to bring relief to war-stricken Europe, and in his steadfast struggle to keep this nation at peace, he has climbed to the pinnacle of renown. We know of no abler speeches than those which Herbert Hoover has given from time to time during the last two years. In certain details we disagree heartily with these speeches—how we wish Mr. Hoover hewed closer to the line of Quakerism! In his delivery of these speeches, the orator is as dull and grumpy as hitherto—he is no match for the fairylike quality of Mr. Roosevelt's utterances! But in character of thought, soberness of judgment, and

integrity of principle, these speeches are as sound as the President's are unsound and superficial. At present, Herbert Hoover is being disgracefully smeared by the deliberate campaign of the pro-war crowd to befoul anybody and everybody who dares to plead for peace. Only a few weeks ago he was pictured, with Lindbergh and Wheeler, as a snake, under the caption, "Nazi rattlesnakes." But the time will come, in his case as in the case of LaFollette in the last war, when he will reap his exceeding great reward. As John Quincy Adams dared to fight the slave power of his day, so Herbert Hoover has dared to fight the war power of this day. It is easy to prophesy what history will say of such heroic leadership.

V

There is one third term to which no good citizen seems to object, and that is a third term for Mayor La Guardia, of New York City. There is opposition, of course—purely partisan opposition. An excellent candidate, District Attorney O'Dwyer, of Brooklyn, has felt it necessary to make a campaign against him, and Tammany Hall and the Democratic Party borough machines generally have given O'Dwyer support. But the effort of the campaign has been like that of a leaky pulmotor applied to a dead person. Opposition to La Guardia simply will not come to life. Behind the Mayor stand the New Deal Democrats, the Republicans, the American Labor Party, and the great mass of independent voters. Above all, there stands the record of the best mayor New York has ever had. There have been other good mayors — Hewitt, Strong, Low, Gaynor, and Mitchell. But La Guardia has excelled them all in a work which has made the largest city in the country also the best governed city. To those who have known New York in its worst days, the situation still seems something like a wild, fantastic dream. Only eight years ago the unspeakable Walker had reduced the metropolis to the lowest levels of bankruptcy and moral degradation. Now, just to look upon the physical appearance of the city—its mighty buildings, its clean streets, its magnificent boulevards and parks, its superb police—is to imagine that some one of the Wellsian visions of the future has come suddenly true. To run over the list of executives and department heads is to discover the ablest group of public administrators in America today. The public morale is unexcelled—a pride in New York the people have never felt before, a conscience sensitive to offense, a good will that is the foundation of integrity and honor. Mayor La Guardia is now a national executive in the defense program of outstanding importance. How does he do it? By trusting a system of political control, which he has built up through years of untiring labor, to run itself efficiently and well! This system has no partisan affiliations or interests—Mr. La Guardia is the nearest thing to non-partisanship that New York has ever had! It is hitched up directly and exclusively to the public interest, is guided by expert civic engineers, and takes its momentum from the confidence of the citizens. Fiorello H. La Guardia can be Mayor of New York as long as he can be persuaded to serve.

VI

Mr. Justice Brandeis, dead in his eighty-fifth year, honored and beloved of all men, was one of our greatest Americans. On the Supreme Bench, he ranked with Story and Holmes as one of the greatest liberal minds in the history of that august tribunal. My memory goes back to the days before the first World War, when controversy raged around Brandeis' name. The storm broke in 1913, when President Wilson made him his Attorney-General. But this storm was nothing to the one which broke three years later, when Mr. Wilson nominated him to the Supreme Court. What a battle there was! It raged for six months. Ex-President Taft led the opposition. President Lowell, of Harvard, marshalled the forces of Brandeis' own state, Massachusetts, against him. Every former president of the American Bar Association stood opposed to him. What was his crime? Was he poor in ability, weak in learning, questionable in character? Not at all! But he was "a radical." He had fought the battles of labor, he had exposed political and business corruption, he had assailed industrial monopoly, he had been a "counsel for the people." The opposition fortunately failed. In due course the leaders of it were ashamed. For Louis D. Brandeis became one of the greatest of all American jurists. A great intellect, a profound student, a free and courageous spirit, a fundamental democrat, he had made himself a master of the economic aspects of modern life, and was extraordinarily equipped therefore to mark the way of progress for America. His career fell in the confusing period when political democracy in this country was being threatened by industrial autocracy. It was his great achievement to show how political democracy must and could unfold into industrial democracy inside the framework of our Constitution. "The end for which we must strive," he wrote, "is the attainment of rule by the people, and that involves industrial democracy as well as political democracy." For decades his name was linked with that of Oliver Wendell Holmes as one of the two dissenters whose minority opinions pointed the path in which the nation would in due course move. It was wonderful — that professional and personal comradeship between Brandeis and Holmes. The blue blood of Boston and the German Jew of Kentucky, the student of economics and the lover of Plato! I like to think that Holmes' towering figure will be standing there at the gates to welcome Brandeis to his last long home.

Jottings

Former Ambassador Bullitt, in an address in Montreal last July, described Hitler and Stalin as "twins out of hell." If this is true, why is Churchill's collaboration with Stalin any better than Petain's collaboration with Hitler? Why is it not worse, since it is voluntary, while Petain's action is compulsory? Is there not at work, in both cases, the disreputable old plea of war necessity?

Only 100 soldiers were killed in the recent war maneuvers. I have no doubt that this fact will be a real consolation to the 100 mothers of these 100 boys.

The President and Secretary of the Christian Pacifist Society of New Zealand and eight other members are serving prison sentences of from three to six months for holding public meetings in behalf of peace. These meetings were held, according to the *Nofrontier News Service,* only when private indoor meetings were banned. The Society has grown in membership, since the beginning of the war, from 375 to 554.

Here is a headline from the October 7th issue of the New York *Times:*

> "Moscow Silences Atheist Press: Step in More Liberal Policy Seen."

Suppressing newspapers is evidence of "liberal policy"! If the Russian government thus bans the atheist press today, how long will it take to suppress the religious press tomorrow when Stalin may no longer have to be a good boy? But—we forgot! There *is* no religious press in Russia!

Does history repeat itself? Look at this from the Jackson (Mississippi) *Daily News,* as quoted in the *Christian Century:*

> The real Christian leaders of this country owe it as a supreme duty to the cause they serve to speak out in words of thunder and declare that the namby-pamby, putty-faced gentry who proclaim the damnable doctrines of peace at any price, non-interference in a foreign war, and all that rot and rant, are not authentic spokesmen for Christianity.

See 1917-1918 newspapers *ad lib.*

The symbol "V" is a dangerous one. It stands for "victory," but also for "Versailles" and "vengeance." It is just as well that the "V" campaign is not now being heard of any more.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

What Constitutes an American?

HAROLD L. ICKES

I want to ask a few simple questions. And then I shall answer them.

What has happened to our vaunted idealism? Why have some of us been behaving like scared chickens? Where is the million-throated, democratic voice of America?

For years it has been dinned into us that we are a weak nation; that we are an inefficient people; that we are simple-minded. For years we have been told that we are beaten, decayed, and that no part of the world belongs to us any longer.

Some amongst us have fallen for this calculated poison. Some amongst us have begun to preach that the "wave of the future" has already passed over us.

They shout—from public platforms, in printed pages, through the microphones—that it is futile to oppose the "wave of the future." They cry that we Americans, we free Americans nourished on Magna Carta and the Declaration of Independence, hold moth-eaten ideas. They exclaim that there is no room for free men in the world any more and that only the slaves will inherit the earth. America—the America of Washington and Jefferson and Lincoln and Walt Whitman—they say, is waiting for the undertaker, and all the hopes and aspirations that have gone into the making of America are dead too.

However, this is not the real point of the story. The real point—the shameful point—is that many of us are listening to them and some of us almost believe them.

I say that it is time for the great American people to raise its voice and cry out in mighty triumph what it is to be an American. And why it is that only Americans, with the aid of our brave allies—yes, let us call them "allies"—the British, can and will build the only future worth having. I mean a future, not of concentration camps, not of physical torture and mental strait jackets, not of sawdust bread or of sawdust Caesars—I mean a future when free men will live free lives in dignity and in security.

This tide of the future, the democratic future, is ours. It is ours if we show ourselves worthy of our culture and of our heritage.

But make no mistake about it; the tide of the democratic future is not like the ocean tide—regular, relentless, and inevitable. Nothing in human affairs is mechanical or inevitable. Nor are Americans mechanical. They are very human indeed.

What constitutes an American? Not color nor race nor religion. Not the pedigree of his family nor the place of his birth. Not the coincidence of his citizenship. Not his social status nor his bank account. Not his trade nor his profession. An American is one who loves justice and believes in the dignity of man. An American is one who will fight for his freedom and that of his neighbor. An American is one who will sacrifice property, ease, and security in order that he and his children may retain the rights of free men. An American is one in whose heart is engraved the immortal second sentence of the Declaration of Independence.

Americans have always known how to fight for their

rights and their way of life. Americans are not afraid to fight. They fight joyously in a just cause.

We Americans know that freedom, like peace, is indivisible. We cannot retain our liberty if three-fourths of the world is enslaved. Brutality, injustice, and slavery, if practiced as dictators would have them, universally and systematically, in the long run would destroy us as surely as a fire raging in our nearby neighbor's house would burn ours if we did not help to put out his.

If we are to retain our own freedom, we must do everything within our power to aid Britain. We must also do everything to restore to the conquered peoples their freedom. This means the Germans, too.

Such a program, if you stop to think, is selfishness on our part. It is the sort of enlightened selfishness that makes the wheels of history go around. It is the sort of enlightened selfishness that wins victories.

Do you know why? Because we cannot live in the world alone, without friends and without allies. If Britain should be defeated, then the totalitarian undertaker will prepare to hang crepe on the door of our own independence.

Perhaps you wonder how this could come about? Perhaps you have heard "them"—the wavers of the future—cry, with calculated malice, that even if Britain were defeated we could live alone and defend ourselves singlehanded, even against the whole world.

I tell you that this is not true.

We would be alone in the world, facing an unscrupulous military-economic bloc that would dominate all of Europe, all of Africa, most of Asia, and perhaps even Russia and South America. Even to do that, we would have to spend most of our national income on tanks and guns and planes and ships. Nor would this be all. We would have to live perpetually as an armed camp, maintaining a huge standing army, a gigantic air force, two vast navies. And we could not do this without endangering our freedom, our democracy, our way of life.

Perhaps such is the America that "they" — the wavers of the future — foresee. Perhaps such is the America that a certain aviator, with his contempt for democracy, would prefer. Perhaps such is the America that a certain Senator desires. Perhaps such is the America that a certain mail-order executive longs for.

But a perpetually militarized, isolated, and impoverished America is not the America that our fathers came here to build.

It is not the America that has been the dream and the hope of countless generations in all parts of the world.

It is not the America that one hundred and thirty million of us would care to live in.

The continued security of our country demands that we aid the enslaved millions of Europe—yes, even of Germany—to win back their liberty and independence. I am convinced that if we do not embark upon such a program we will lose our own freedom.

We should be clear on this point. What is convulsing the world today is not merely another old-fashioned war. It is a counter revolution against our ideas and ideals, against our sense of justice and our human values.

This war is not an ordinary war. It is not a conflict for markets or territories. It is a desperate struggle for the possession of the souls of men.

This is why the British are not fighting for themselves alone. They are fighting to preserve freedom for mankind. For the moment, the battleground is the British Isles. But they are fighting our war; they are the first soldiers in trenches that are also our front-line trenches.

In this world war of ideas and of loyalties, we believers in democracy must do two things.

We must unite our forces to form one great democratic international.

We must offer a clear program to freedom-loving peoples throughout the world.

Freedom-loving men and women in every land must organize and tighten their ranks. The masses everywhere must be helped to fight their oppressors and conquerors.

We, free, democratic Americans are in a position to help. We know that the spirit of freedom never dies. We know that men have fought and bled for freedom since time immemorial. We realize that the liberty-loving German people are only temporarily enslaved. We do not doubt that the Italian people are looking forward to the appearance of another Garibaldi. We know how the Poles have for centuries maintained a heroic resistance against tyranny. We remember the brave struggle of the Hungarians under Kossuth and other leaders. We recall the heroic figure of Masaryk and the gallant fight for freedom of the Czech people. The story of the blows for liberty and independence by the Yugoslavs, especially the Serbs, is a saga of extraordinary heroism. The Greeks will stand again at Thermopylae, as they have in the past. The annals of our American sister-republics, too, are glorious with freedom-inspiring exploits. The noble figure of Simon Bolivar, the great South American liberator, has naturally been compared with that of George Washington.

No, liberty never dies. The Genghis Khans come and go. The Attilas come and go. The Hitlers flash and sputter out. But freedom endures.

Destroy a whole generation of those who have known how to walk with heads erect in God's free air, and the next generation will rise against the oppressors and restore freedom. Today in Europe, the Nazi Attila may gloat that he has destroyed democracy. He is wrong. In small farmhouses all over Central Europe, in the shops of Germany and Italy, on the docks of Holland and Belgium, freedom still lives in the hearts of men. It will endure like a hardy tree gone into the winter-time, awaiting the spring.

And, like spring, spreading from the South into Scandinavia, the democratic revolution will come. And men with democratic hearts will experience comradeship across artificial boundaries.

These men and women, hundreds of millions of them, now in bondage or threatened with slavery, are our comrades and our allies. They are only waiting for our leadership and our encouragement, for the spark that we can supply.

These hundreds of millions of liberty-loving people, now oppressed, constitute the greatest sixth column in history. They have the will to destroy the Nazi gangsters.

We have always helped in struggles for human freedom. And we will help again.

But our hundreds of millions of liberty-loving allies would despair if we did not provide aid and encouragement.

The quicker we help them, the sooner this dreadful revolution will be over.

We cannot, we must not, we dare not delay.

The Twenty-Fifth Atlanta Conference

W. E. B. DuBOIS

Some eleven million Americans are placed today in an unenviable position. Theoretically they are asked to take sides in a struggle between democracy and dictatorship. Realistically, they have not been able themselves to enjoy many of the advantages of democracy in the United States: two-thirds of them living in the South are almost completely disfranchised; the other third living in the North are compelled to use their political power primarily as means of income. Moreover, beyond themselves and in the general organization of the country they are unable to see the triumph of democracy for the masses of the people in the nation. American Negroes cannot, therefore, enter into the present controversy with enthusiasm. Quite naturally as lifelong victims of caste, autocracy, and privilege, they believe that the democratic way of life will in the long run triumph in human government and in economic organization, if civilization survives. They do not believe that democracy has triumphed in the British Empire, nor in America, and they know it has failed in their own case.

On the other hand, facing the menace of Hitlerism as shown in Germany, Italy, and elsewhere, they are painfully aware that the increase of race antagonism and exaggerated theories of race threaten many people of the world, and particularly the darker races. Their mental reaction, therefore, in the present situation is a paradox. They know that their progress in America has probably been greater than that of any Negro group in the world; that this is due partly to the coöperation and attitude of white Americans, but in much greater degree to the determination and hard work of Negroes themselves, in spite of slavery and caste. They know, on the other hand, that back of Hitlerism, and one of its strongest foundation stones, is industrial rationalization and state control of economic factors and redistribution of goods and services among the mass of people; to this plan both England and America will have to yield, in the long run.

What, then, must American Negroes do? First of all, as a minority group they are compelled to obey the law and take their place among the armed forces, in spite of the segregation which the basic draft law lays down; and despite the discrimination and other difficulties which the administration of the draft involves. On the other hand, there is in the present defense organization opportunities for Negroes which they must recognize as being of the highest importance. They have been systematically and deliberately excluded from many modern techniques. The older technical training which they inherited from slavery and added to through industrial education, has lost much of its importance because of great changes in industrial methods during the last quarter century. From the newer techniques in mechanics, chemistry and electricity, and in much of mass production, the Negro has been excluded: first, by public opinion; second, by the attitude of employers; third, and especially, by the fact that the great majority of the more powerfully organized trades unions have sought deliberately to exclude Negroes, no matter what their abilities might be. For a generation the Negro group in the United States in a sense went simultaneously forward and backward, increasing in average intelligence, with notable cases of individual accomplishment; and at the same time losing economic status and receiving a fluctuating but on the whole progressive decrease in average income.

A few facts will illustrate the fluctuation of Negro employment from 1910 to 1930. Negro farmers and farm laborers have shown steady decrease in actual numbers and in proportion from the beginning of the century; domestic service has wavered, decreasing until 1920 and then suddenly increasing under the burden of the depression; artisans have fluctuated; blacksmiths have steadily decreased; masons have decreased rapidly since the first World War; carpenters have remained stationary; machinists increased rapidly at the time of the first World War and then decreased. The increased use of cement has multiplied the number of plasterers and cement finishers, and painters have also increased. Favorable attitudes of the union and low and intermittent pay have led to an increase of Negro workers in the decadent mining industry. In the manufacturing and mechanical industries, and in transportation and communication, the number of Negroes increased until after the first World War, although chiefly as unskilled laborers. Since 1920, the number has remained about stationary.

The story of the depression as it affected American Negroes, has not yet been adequately attempted. In many great centers of population more than a third of the Negroes went on public charity and more ought to have gone but suffered deliberate discrimination in the South. In addition to this, the greater tragedy was the loss of thousands of farms and homes, the disappearance of savings among the rising Negro middle class, the collapse of Negro business—banks, insurance, and retail businesses. The economic change deserves to be called revolutionary, because this "middle" class was the upper class in the Negro world in knowledge, training, and wealth. Organizations demanded the displacement of the Negro in industry, and the Ku Klux Klan rose and flourished with new life, largely on this issue. The new organizations of "White Shirts," "Blue Shirts," and the like, spread in the South; and beyond such organized demand, was the widespread feeling in America that in the matter of re-employment and re-adjustment after the depression, the first duty of white Americans was toward white folk and that consideration of long service and desert and need ought not to be taken into account across the Color Line.

Under the New Deal the Negro came in for some attention, but the pressing question was chiefly as to how far discrimination against him should be recognized either in wage, hours of work, or employment under any circumstances. Also starting with the New Deal came a rationalization of the displacement of the Negro worker due to efforts toward raising wages. When minimum wages and standards of work have been enforced by law or made advisable by public opinion, in numberless cases poorly paid Negro workers were replaced by white workers with better wages and better hours of work. The resultant natural increase in efficiency has often been attributed to racial replacement alone. In the labor movement, the organization of the CIO gave Negroes far better recognition than the American Federation of Labor ever had; while Communists wooed Negroes with open arms. Despite

all this, unemployment among Negroes reached a dangerous high.

This has worked for social dislocation among Negroes. It is difficult to get figures, but certainly spread of disease must have greatly retarded the Negro population; and stealing and homicide must have been largely augmented. A general philosophy arose tinged with irritation and despair. Pressure groups demanding employment and even threatening violence appeared in Chicago, New York, and Washington. Their success both encouraged and appalled.

A rough calculation of Negro incomes which I essayed in 1939 had to be largely guesswork because of lack of data; and yet it seemed to indicate that of over 2,800,000 Negro families in the United States, 1,200,000 were receiving less than $500 a year and 1,000,000 between $500 and $1,000; leaving 600,000 families with $1,000 a year, of whom only one-tenth received more than $2,500. This estimate is not accurate, and may be too low, but I believe that it is not an unfair indication of the truth. Housing and youth projects have helped Negroes greatly, but only indirectly have they faced the basic problem of employment and income.

The advent of the second World War finds the Negro fighting desperately for a place in the new defense industry and accomplishing something; but in the long run that is a passing and minor matter as compared with the general economic future which must be faced when the world is again sane and at peace, and when the world's whole pattern of income, work, and wage will be found radically altered.

There looms, then, before colored men of education and vision the question as to what can be done by thought and planning for the future of Negro economy, for solving the question as to how the Negro is going to earn a decent living and be in position to take a normal part in the future world. If economic planning for nations presents great difficulties, similar planning for national minorities is unusually hazardous. It faces all the difficulties of racial segregation, of artificial loyalties and increased animosities; so that among Negroes today there is serious difference of opinion, first as to whether any such economic planning is possible; and secondly, whether it is in any way advisable. Can a group within a group plan for its work and wage except as a part of a larger group and in accordance with the will of the majority? And even if it can, is not this a direct and dangerous way of increasing racial friction?

Whatever the answer to this question is, manifestly it is a time for careful conference and thought. Several such conferences have been held, notably at Hampton Institute, Fisk University, and elsewhere. But they have been primarily concerned with the integration of the Negro in the defense program. It seemed to us at Atlanta University that a further movement was necessary,—that is, a series of conferences looking toward a long-time program of Negro economic stabilization after the war. We called, therefore, in April of this year the First Phylon Institute as a Twenty-Fifth Atlanta University Conference, following after a lapse of nearly a quarter of a century the twenty-fourth conference of 1916.

The Atlanta University Conferences were started in 1897 and were held annually for a period of seventeen years, when they were closed by the first World War. They succeeded and supplemented the Hampton and Tuskegee Conferences which studied social uplift mainly in rural regions. The Atlanta Conferences, on the contrary, were the first systematic attempt in America to apply scientific methods of social investigation and measurement to the whole mass of the Negro problems, urban and rural, past and present.

The Twenty-Fifth Conference took as its subject "The Economic Condition and Future Security of the American Negro." It was designed to be a comparatively small study group bringing together knowledge already available concerning the Negro's economic conditions and beginning in this and succeeding conferences to ask: What can and ought to be done for the betterment of the Negro's economic condition? The organizations invited to send delegates included, first, the powerful group of Negro land-grant colleges; institutions which since 1913 have increased from less than a thousand college students and an annual income of $850,000 to 9,500 students and income of $2,500,000 in 1939. They are in a peculiar way suited to explore the field of the Negro's economic future. These institutions have especially had laid upon them by the Southern states the duty of vocational guidance. By working separately and without concerted plan, the results while excellent in some respects have neither been unified nor strikingly helpful. With these institutions, of course, were the older private institutions which have supplied for decades teachers and leaders for the newer colleges; and numbers of individuals, colored and white, interested in this problem. New and younger students, employed in these institutions and elsewhere were sought to give this group expert advice. Some fifty-one young scholars from thirty-five institutions were present with graphs, finished studies, and plans which were used in consultation.

While in a sense, this is hardly the time for scientific calm and considered planning on social problems, yet, on the other hand, in the midst of war and rumors of war, perhaps it is possible to maintain enough of scientific attitude and careful study to make new beginnings and an interesting synthesis of older and newer thought concerning industrial education, vocational guidance, and higher training, and for an economic leadership which may in time evolve plans parallel to those which the whole world must take into consideration after the present revolution.

The conference avoided dogmatism but explored possibilities. How far, it asked, is it feasible to apply the technique of consumers' coöperation and even of coöperative wholesales and coöperative production, to the present situation of the Negro? How far can the technique of organized buying power force employment and what dangers are there in such procedures? What part can Negroes take in the TVA and similar vast power developments? The conference attempted to make clear the paths of alliance which Negroes can make with forward movements, especially with movements that have in mind fundamental betterment of present methods of production and distribution. It did not attempt to rationalize nor solve the present problem of Negroes in war and national defense, but rather looked forward to the time when civilization, discarding violence as a major means of social change, will revert to slower and more rational methods of advancing human culture; for guidance at that time, we will need the most careful factual knowledge and reasoned theory for the treatment of minority groups.

A New Dedication to National Unity

ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH

Has it occurred to you that in all of the output of wartime books and magazine articles, not to mention the enormous grist of editorials in ten thousand newspapers, there is not, up to the present hour, a word of lament nor a cry of warning about our lack or loss of national unity? This is an astonishing and magnificent commentary on the state of the Union. Even about the war itself and the issue of going in or staying out of it, as direct and "shooting" participants, there is not, East or West or in the Midlands, anything like disunity, though to be sure there is vigorous difference of opinion. I know we are not all agreed, in this period of deciding our course, but that is a matter which does not now and I am sure will not, in whatever may eventuate, make a division among the people.

I have just returned to New England from a series of meetings which I addressed in Madison, Wisconsin, during the summer session of the University. It struck me as I talked with many people how the mental attitude in that marvelous region, which for me is high America, varies from, but does not differ at bottom from the more excited and stern disposition here along the Atlantic seaboard to get right into the battle to exterminate Nazism and save the country to its four freedoms.

Your citizen in the geographical center plainly does not take so gravely the danger, or at least the imminence of the threat of invasion. His neighbor who lives on the western shore looking out to Japan, and the other one who scans the sky for a bombing enemy from Europe, seem to him, if I get him right, quite normal in their reaction, but for himself there is a certain quietness and thoughtfulness which is not at all the result of detachment but is rather a more accurate perspective on the situation as it really is. Besides that, he is as young for liberty, and as quick and sensitive about the loss of it, indeed as insistent upon the enlargement of liberty, as the peaceable Colonial farmers who made up their minds but would not be rushed.

The sentiment, that is to say, is one and the same, wherever you turn, and the United States of America are one and indivisible. They will continue and increase their unity, though it may turn out that we shall not have to do any actual fighting.

It was by no means like this in the Great War. I venture to assert that we were not nearly as much of one mind in 1917 as we are today. The business of war was no less abhorrent then than it is now. That is not the question. It is rather the matter of our unity, that inner spiritual coherence which has been growing since the foundation of the Republic.

Before 1914 we were both a provincial people, in our lack of awareness of the rest of the world, and a good-natural conglomeration of sectional-minded individuals who were loosely associated in a vast country where the main thing was apparently unlimited personal opportunity.

In neither of these respects are we like that today. We are world-minded and we have the collectivist spirit. My candid opinion is that we as a people are more nearly like the citizens of the Soviet Union in our sense of a planetary mission for the enlargement of democracy in all social and economic phases, than we are like ourselves of twenty-five years ago. And the popular morale of which we hear from trustworthy reporters of the battle in Russia, and which does not surprise me in the least because I saw it and lived with it in Moscow in 1935, is here with us in a higher degree by far than at any earlier time in our history.

Speaking of history, as a good many Americans are today, in timely books, notably Ernest Sutherland Bates in *American Faith,* and Sherwood Eddy in *The Kingdom of God and the American Dream,* it is good for one to read the record of how far we have come and how we have arrived at our present national unity. Both of these men, and some others, show that out of the Reformation we here came to a political and social revolution. We follow the course of the "middle class autocracy in Calvinistic New England at war with Baptist individualism and Quaker equalitarianism, through the rise of rationalistic Deism into the popular revolutionary movement." There was a Federalist counter-revolution, but the makers of America soon were on the main road again in the Jeffersonian and Jacksonian revolutions, which with little halting or deviation led us to the abolition of slavery and the reassertion of freedom in the Civil War.

Yet, as Bates tells us, the story is by no means, even at this day, "a picture of a really unified America." There are indeed still among us class struggles and economic struggles, and always the chance that may mean relapse, with further gains problematic. ". . . but take us just as we are, and it seems to me we must agree that we are farther along the path followed by American democracy toward a more real unity, the unity of a whole people without class divisions; the physical security that can come only with the control of the means of production, now for the first time really possible; and the mental security that arises from a confirmed habit of recognizing truths wherever found."

All of this means that we are animated by one spirit, and that unity is working like an irresistible and gracious ferment, toward the unification of us in all outward relations in our life as a people and a nation. We are not talking much about it, but we believe it is true. The fact is we are so sure about it, we are not outwardly emotional as younger patriots once were. And we are fortunate to have a greater substance for our faith than a former generation. There is more to have faith in, out of the accumulation of our history as a people.

Today our country in its later achievements means something, just as the Revolution meant something in the beginning. Especially the economic adjustments, which are in fact more nearly a revolution, mean something. We are told they were real men who breathed and moved, in forming this democracy, men who believed and had ideas, and very valid ideas, as Stephen Vincent Benet says, "for our very present time of trouble and confusion." We have trouble and confusion about many things, no doubt, but of the main thing we are certain, and here is no confusion at all. It is our faith in one another; it is faith in liberty, and faith in faith itself.

Liberty not joined to faith, says Helen Keller, is

already half dead. She may be right in her low estimate of the present measure of that faith.

> Americans have for the most part not had faith enough in themselves [in her opinion] to demand a decisive share in rearing the structure of the government. Rarely have they gone to the trouble of choosing men of high politics who would truly represent their interests. They have shirked their responsibility, and faith, the friendly, unitive force, has been left to preachers, "dreamers," and invalids when it should have been communicated throughout society.

Here is timely admonishment, quite in the national tradition of self-criticism and, in its very urgency, a testimony of faith that we will exercise this "unitive force" for today and tomorrow. As for the war, a country's surest defense is the loyal brotherliness of all its people and their responsible faith in serving one another. The strength of our arms is the measure of our mutual devotion.

After the war, whether we are actually in it or not, and no matter which side wins, we are going to suffer the hardest years in our history. The economic prospect, for one thing, is simply appalling. Compared with the desperate decade through which we have been passing, the time which is coming is incalculably greater in its dire possibilities. The strain upon our faith is already testing us. Each one of us can tell how strong that faith is, because faith is personal. It is yours and mine. Of course, it is not strong enough, as you and I know.

The hour is at hand for a new dedication of ourselves to a faith so powerful that it will surely prevail against the faith in force and hate, and full of contempt for man. This latter faith is a positive thing, and the dictator is a real and mighty person. But dictators, let us remember, are both mortal and wrong. They pass away; this is their history from Darius to Hitler. It is good for us to recite these days the lines of William Wetmore Story on the long annals of mankind, and to contrast with him the names of those who "won the success of a day" and those who are "life's victors." The latter were invariably those who had faith in human nature and in the promotion of the people's freedom, happiness, and well-being. They are the liberals in every age, for a liberal is in etymology and in fact one having the spirit of a free man and earnestly desiring the liberation of all of his fellows.

Among liberals none have been greater than the preachers who, as Calvin Coolidge remarked, were the real founders of this country. That is, the liberal colonial ministers, such as Jonas Clarke, Jonathan Mayhew, and Charles Chauncy, not only preached political liberty as a religious principle, but greatly helped the founding fathers in defining the principles and in implementing them through the provisions of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. In other words, these religious leaders really gave a theological foundation to the nascent democracy. The cardinal doctrine was their faith in man.

As a matter of fact, there was far greater emphasis upon the human than upon the divine in their indoctrination, though, of course, the ground of their belief was God. It has been indeed characteristic of ministers of religion down these two hundred years to establish and strengthen this democratic faith.

Not all preachers either in the early days or in our own have been theologically liberal and democratic. The ancient dogma appropriated by a large number of churches that says man is by nature depraved, a creature of sin and abomination who can of himself do nothing but only be redeemed by the arbitrary election of him by a God of awful sovereignty and inscrutable ways, is not yet dead in this land. It is a doctrine that does not suit a democracy; besides, it was generally agreed among religious leaders of virtually all denominations that it was untrue to Christ so to represent Deity.

Then a strange thing occurred. After the Great War, and with the economic collapse of the country, there arose among a large number of ministers, including teachers, writers and preachers, a scornful reproach of mankind in general because of these disastrous events for which some men were responsible. There were the most incredible expressions of contempt for human nature, and the theological degradation of man was shocking and shameful. This reversal of the faith in humanity, which is the basic faith of democracy, is precisely what Hitler preaches. Anyone who believes as he does is guilty of a great betrayal.

By such teaching, national unity is assaulted in a sinister and most dangerous way. Religious dogmas are the most potent of all ideas, whether they are right or wrong, for good or ill. Fortunately, the doctrine of man as capable of all good, and, under freedom and faith in his kind, destined to build a coöperative commonwealth, is rooted deep in America. It must grow from strength to strength, until our unity is perfected and we stand spiritually invincible. This is the message for the times, especially in the churches.

Conscription

We are soldiers in the Army of the Ill,
  Conscripted without question, without plan,
To fight with soul, with body, and with will,
  The demon of Disease, the foe of man.

We must face whatever hardship it entails;
  Though some have warning, most have none at all.
No plea of labor, duty, love, prevails;
  Peremptorily each must meet the call.

We struggle with a soulless foe unseen,
  Whose legions sap and mine by day and night;
Who know no mercy—when the struggle's keen
  Sham death, then treacherously renew the fight.

No martial music tunes our weary way,
  No banners bright, or loudly voiced applause,
No gorgeous pomp or glittering array,
  As we fight the grimmest of eternal wars.

But our souls are steeled by faith in God above;
  Our hearts are strengthened, when our spirit's low,
By thoughts of those who love us, those we love,
  Whose hopeful prayers go with us as we go.

Then forward, brothers, bravely to the fray!
  In war, in peace, some soldiers always fall.
Enough for us the struggle of today—
  The future is with God, who guides us all.

JEROME ALEXANDER.

The Youth Odyssey

RUTH SHIRLEY

For the past twenty years we have been hearing much about the need for a moral equivalent for war.

In our country we have much, dangerously much, unemployed youth energy. This energy is seething and burning inside youth and being throttled down into (1) social rejection of unemployment or (2) the partial use and unsatisfactoriness of being given only trivial things to do.

Much of our youth in being "educated" academically has been disinherited from the strong spiritual resources which stem from the reaction of our pioneers to a new world.

This spiritual proletarianization in line with the mature economy theory has meant that manpower, money, and infinite physical resources sit unused in the same vicinity, while employee-minded products of our educational system lament the passing of the kind of opportunity incident to geographic pioneering days, and are blind, senseless to the opportunities of the challenging real new world in which we now live. We have finished with geographic pioneering days as a country although there is still much of that to be done in special areas. Now we are free to begin that far more challenging and promising era in our country of *cultural pioneering*. In geographic pioneering days we had to spread things thin simply because of geographic expanse. Now we can turn our attention to spreading them thick.

Manpower, money, and physical resources get together into production only when there is another cataclyst present. In making copies of copies, clerks can form this cataclyst. In making new enterprises, only one thing can do it. This element is always rewarded magnificently. Without it manpower, money, and physical resources are meaningless, powerless, useless to themselves or others. This element is entrepreneurship.

Entrepreneurship is composed of three features by which you shall know it: imagination, courage, and initiative.

Manpower, money, and physical resources never get together to produce in the real world until something preliminary has happened. That something is that they get together first in the mental world, in somebody's mind.

This quality of creative imagination which is the fundamental prerequisite of any activity, except chaos, in the real world has been so ignored in modern education that it is no wonder that normal rules of nature and matter have imposed a natural vengeance on modern man by delivering him to one of the two demons of the modern world: unemployment.

So misunderstood has this quality been that it has been the fashion, even among those who would have otherwise had the potentiality of developing it in themselves, to speak always of mental design as "impractical idealism." This is so unrealistic as to be almost laughable, except that in scorning the normal laws of creation, modern democratic man has simply demonstrated them more forcibly, and to his own great detriment.

Our education has turned out its products who go "looking for jobs." They want to be told what to do from nine until five. They want a stated, regular salary, with paid vacations. They want to forget work after office hours, and have "hobbies" and do some escapist activities in their "leisure time." They think little of a profession. They want a job. When they do not have such a job, setting out for them a definite routine at definite hours, they consider themselves unemployed. They are victims of the self-paralysis of employee-mindedness.

In a democratic capitalistic society, there must be a certain proportion of employer-minded people. When employee-mindedness becomes the end result of the education of any society, there can be but one result—that the State must be the employer for the whole mass of employees, or employables. Unless there is the leavening of the entrepreneur in some proportion, society bogs down into masses.

Obviously, what is needed in a society which has an unemployment problem is *more employers*. For a society which has hierarchy, that is, which is not a mass society, there must be a certain proportion of individuals who take the responsibility of giving employment to the others. Unfortunately enough, in the very society plagued by lack of employers, and therefore unemployment, there has arisen a kind of undue modesty and a surge of mistaken "democracy" or return to vulgarity which makes it seem the admirable or decent thing to do for those with the potentialities of professional people or of entrepreneurs to go get jobs as laborers. Lacking anything in the curricula for the development of creative imagination, our modern education is turning out a population of clerks. It is thought democratic for those whose privileges and abilities fit them for entrepreneurship to look for a job to work with their hands. Daughters of our best families and educational traditions consider it a fine thing to get a job as a secretary.

What we need is more executives. The executive and entrepreneur must be distinguished in this way. The entrepreneur sees manpower and physical resource. He puts them together and gets a product—in his mind. He furnishes the blueprint. Usually somebody else furnishes the money. The executive follows the blueprint in administering the physical putting together of the elements to get the physical product. The executive is the man who has the object set before him, and he marshals the materials and personnel to accomplish it. He is told WHAT shall be done. He tells his underlings, clerks, secretaries, and assistants HOW that object shall be attained, and they follow those specifications.

The employee-minded person may sit in the midst of an overabundance of manpower, an overabundance of idle money waiting to be bid for, and infinite physical resource, and starve.

The story of Materlinck's Bluebird is significant and usually misinterpreted. Materlinck knew all the time that the bluebird was in the backyard. The children did not. They traveled over the world looking for this bluebird of happiness, and finally, returning, found it in their own backyard. The point of the story is not "what a shame the children went everywhere looking for the bluebird when all the time it was in their backyard." The point of the story is "the bluebird was there all the time; but only by traveling, by looking for it elsewhere, by going away and returning did they

recognize it there in the backyard when they returned."

America is abundantly rich. Indeed, an embarrassment of riches is what we have: too much money, too much gold, too much manpower, so much land that it has never been carefully husbanded. This very embarrassment of riches has made lumpiness. Some of us are rich, with none of the inner resources which can turn financial surplus into real wealth. Some of us feel poor and talk about confiscatory taxes while driving about in a Packard, and dispensing money indiscriminately in ugly places for bad food and raucous noises to accompany it.

Snappy lunches, lack of time to eat, and noise like blows to one's spirit as one eats, have developed insecurity feelings in many Americans in the midst of plenty. It has been demonstrated, as the result of careful psychological research, that lack of time to eat and rush and bustle while eating, arouse insecurity feelings which cannot be rationally assuaged no matter how comfortable one's income. These insecurity feelings result in bad work and fear of the future, and an incipient will to failure which creates personal reactions that make loss of securities—income, possessions, affections of others, positions—likely, and sometimes inevitable.

One need only look at Switzerland, a completely Have Not nation by any possible measure of economic or physical resources. Switzerland's real wealth is in the heart of her people, in the calmness of their spirit before no matter what obstacle and danger, in their willingness and desire to work *hard*—indeed, to mow with scythes the mountains to the very top, carrying down on their backs at one time half a wagon load of grass for hay.

Switzerland's wealth is in the beauty of her Alps, which she has never despoiled with ugliness of road signs, nor with high walls of private property shutting out the public onto a cement highway, nor with natural wonders fenced in, and admission charged. Switzerland's wealth is in the freeness and naturalness of the beauty of her lakes and mountains, and the good food and comfortable hostelry with which she supplies travelers who come to drink in her beauty, and those seeking refreshment who come to ski, to study, to live in her calm serenity.

In two years in Switzerland, I never saw a beggar nor a destitute person. I heard no bemoaning about lack of opportunity. Life there was restrained, pleasant, modulated.

America has infinite resources. Surplus food has been destroyed and burned. The human being is something like a sponge—there can be abundant moisture all around, but the amount the sponge can absorb depends upon its own nature.

American youth have been so frigthened by unemployment statistics that they have become over-wary, eager to jump into the first pigeonhole. To Europeans who are unhappy and menaced and underprivileged, America seems today as always the land of promise and plenty. American youth, sitting in the midst of plenty, mistrusting their own executive ability, weighed down bv fear of unemployment statistics, are ineffectual *only from lack of perspective.*

The old *Tour du Monde* idea had a good deal in it and did much to develop the entrepreneur spirit as well as to cultivate graciousness of living and interchange of art. The *Tour du Monde* as the cherry on the top of the de luxe education had a round-trip connotation a bit different from the adventure story motif of "going out into the world to seek your fortune."

Goodness knows, throughout history, the youth who had finished his education or apprenticeship always started out to seek and make his fortune. It is an irony that in this age when transportation is the most simplified and speeded up of that in any age, youth should want to walk out of school into a ready-made pigeonhole. Security with a capital S is for the old. Adventure, seeking, making, is for the young.

The *Tour du Monde* idea was always that the privileged youth would collect experiences and observations and associations and friends throughout the world to give perspective to the life he would live and the career he would build when he came home. He brought back treasures and viewpoints and ideas which enriched his own community, with the main enrichment being the wealth of his own personality.

Those whose chief concern it is to develop the potentialities, enrich the lives, and mitigate the lumpiness of America's own culture and economy, those whose desire it is to see unemployment routed as a threat to our way of life, are the ones whose aims will be most advanced by the Youth Odyssey.

The Youth Odyssey, the first peacetime expeditionary force of its kind in the history of the world, will surge into Europe the moment hostilities cease.

This war will end some day. When it does, unquestionably the United States will be less exhausted than Europe. There will be a moment of suspended animation during which a great positive gesture will have momentous historic influences. Europe will be physically prostrate. But the very fact that civilian populations have faced death as have soldiers in this war has meant that the last aspect of war as a tournament is swept away. Homes have been directly attacked. When homes are directly attacked, a whole culture rocks.

In Europe, I saw the reaction to this war to be one of infinitely wholesome possibilities. First, no one really wanted, viciously, to fight. Secondly, no one is under the illusion that they are fighting brutes or beasts. Everyone knows that human beings are committing a form of partial suicide in fighting at all in this way. Thirdly, after one has faced death, and still lives, a miracle has usually happened. Superficial concerns and trivial personal anxieties are swept away. One is "living on velvet." Life, itself, is shown as a fundamental goodness and a great gift of which to be appreciative.

When considered in the light of modern psychological knowledge, the fact that self-analysis has been France's reaction to disaster is one of the most promising things in history. This is the most wholesome reaction to disaster and one which promises rebuilding on a realistic and substantial basis.

This "living on velvet," this self-analysis, this democracy of spirit which facing death in common has instilled means to me that as never before in history the iron will be hot in Europe for democracy after this war. We see now, in England's reaction to her travail, a democracy surpassing anything ever known in England before, an acceleration of a process through which England was undoubtedly going, but which has thus been speeded up, with obstacles of reaction obviated. To put it simply, Europe will be physically exhausted but spiritually awakened.

If she be left in her physical prostration, it may turn to a desperation which can bring general reduction to

lowest common denominators of human beings, and a freezing into a political situation in which to aspire may be impossible.

It is at this moment, that American youth equipped as a peacetime expeditionary force—with not only their own supplies, but materials for rebuilding and feeding and giving physical exercise and mental stimulation and moral encouragement—will throw their weight into the balance on the side of confidence in the future and the human race to be free yet orderly, aspiring, and mutually considerate.

War versus peace is not war versus blank. At least as much effort and energy and determination must be put into development of peacetime forces and activities as one puts into building up war machines, if a strong enough mechanism of international relationship based on the premise of no war is to be achieved.

The Youth Odyssey is the moral equivalent for war for which social and political diagnosticians have plead for twenty years. The Youth Odyssey is the means of using youth energy—which, unemployed and unintegrated into reinforcement of current political design, is infinitely dangerous—for an important, socially significant and demanding enterprise.

Education and sharing of reconstruction will be the motif, not social service and breadline patching up. With the supplies furnished to Europeans will come personality. "For the gift without the giver is bare."

Besides being the only type of way to minister to Europe, as we must after this war, which will keep us from being left holding our moneybags with Europe left feeling resentful that we have profited, and more resentful as she is unable to repay what we have lent her in money, the Youth Odyssey is also the means by which American youth shall regain the perspective and entrepreneurship of self-reliance to go on developing our own civilization, and to surge out of the slump into which curtailed imaginations have pushed a dangerous segment of youth.

American youth will see with what comparatively few resources Europeans work. American youth will see what graciousness of living, what harmony and beauty and congenial rhythms of life Europeans have developed, in many places, with relatively few technical and mechanical gadgets. American youth, seeing Europe's restrictions and limitations, will come home deeply grateful for being American, and fired with realization of the great resources of our country and the knowledge that gracious living is a combination of intelligence, taste, discrimination and calm, far more than it is cellophane-wrapped gadgets with price tags.

Of course, the whole Youth Odyssey will be formed to give something to Europe—material and moral aid in her extremity, and personal demonstration of the success of our conscious political design; but the aid shall be given with humility on the part of the giver.

In the realization of having poured itself out in a moment of historic crisis, in the deep appreciation of the privileges of being an American, and in the self-reliance and more profound sense of values which will result from participation in the Youth Odyssey (ground crews at home will have their part, too) will come the requisite state of mind as the result of which development of a new art of living will come to give us peace.

Enough of Defense Talk!

DOROTHY BUSHNELL COLE

Enough of defense, defense effort, defense talk, defense plans. The best defense is offense. Are we going to continue sitting back supinely behind feeble barricades waiting to fight with bayonets soldiers who drop from the sky behind those barricades? Are we going to build ships endlessly to take aid to Great Britain while Germany seizes bases, islands, docks, ports, and whole countries from which to send submarines to destroy those ships? Are we going to talk convoy, neutral patrols, a line of steel to England, when Germany is striking all over and everywhere conducting her war of nerves?

Why this idle sitting by and waiting to shut the barndoor until *after* the horse has been stolen? Why this posting of "no smoking" signs *after* the garage has burned down. Why the hopeless post mortems after Crete, after Greece, after Jugoslavia, and France, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Holland, Belgium, Denmark, and Norway? What are post mortems for if not to be able to prescribe in time for the next patient? What are they for if not to show how to save the next life; how the next time to cheat death; how the next time to operate before the death rattle has begun?

But we continue to talk about aid to Britain and about defense, while the world crumbles about our heads. We see in the Mediterranean, Britain hampered by lack of men, unable to have a great army in Egypt, in Syria, in Cyprus, in Libya at one time, which she obviously needs, while we sit back and talk of the battle of production as if it were the only battle, the only key to victory.

I sound harsh. I sound as if in the next breath I would say, "I told you so." Often I have sat back with admiration and sometimes sheer amazement that Eden and that mighty Churchill have devoted themselves to the business in hand without rancor, without hostility toward all those many Englishmen who could not see that England was selling Czechoslovakia down the river. And now, if we do not jump in and save England next, when our turn comes, will *I* be able to do my bit calmly, and with determination watch, or fight fire, or shoot, or fly, or jump, or sew, or make bandages, or whatever turns out to be my duty, without ever saying, "This could have been avoided, you know, if you had only listened to me. Why did we wait until Hitler struck our shores, why did we not see with Van Paassen that our Maginot Line extended from Greenland to Iceland, to Britain, to Dakar, to the Cape Verde and Canary Islands, and to Cape Town? If we only had jumped in and established bases at *all* these spots!"

Or, to go back still farther and say, "If all the democratic countries had only stood together in one great federation or league, determined to stop an aggressor, then would Japan have marched into Manchuria ten years ago? Would Italy have gone into Ethiopia? Germany into the Rhineland?"

Germany has been at war with Russia since June

22nd. Suddenly, fearlessly, she struck. The commentators tell of the greatest, bloodiest battle in all history.

What was Hitler's little game? To get Russia against Germany, so we would not be against Germany because we have always been against Russia. The wise say that Stalin would have capitulated, but, you see, oh you must see, that Russia must be attacked as a subtle roundabout strategy for slowing up our battle of production. Churchill saw the scheme and was not taken in by it, nor by Hitler's traditional program of wanting to pose to the West as the savior of civilization against Bolshevism. Roosevelt saw the scheme and announced immediately that we would give aid to Russia. But again we hear the voices of the appeasers. What are we going to do with them? Let's ignore them. Perhaps in a few months when our boys are going to war in numbers, they, too, like Chamberlain, will die of broken hearts at the sight of their folly, their ignorance, their shortsightedness.

But, fortunately for us all, we have a Churchill in the White House now, before the shooting has begun—a Churchill who has seen all along that Hitler is *our* enemy, a scourge to the whole human race. But let us now untie our president's hands, at once. The sooner we attack Hitler, the sooner it can all be over, with less loss of life, of time, of property, than if we wait. Do you agree? Then let your president know about it! Unprepared, you say? Forget it. That wail perhaps deterred Britain. Now we know it would have been better if she had taken her stand sooner, and with rather than against Czechoslovakia who was prepared.

The hour has struck. Open your ears wide, America, and you will hear the bells tolling. Yes, it is the eleventh hour; in a few minutes it will be too late. Tomorrow we may be slaves, you and I together, and our children and our children's children. And then, perhaps, the biblical prophecy may come true, that the sins of the fathers will be visited upon the children, yea, unto the third and fourth generations.

"The Forbidden Theme"

KARL M. CHWOROWSKY

While the chorus of indignation aroused by Mr. Lindbergh's completely unwarranted and unjustifiable attack on the Jews of America in his Des Moines speech is growing daily in volume and intensity, and while every week adds names of distinction and national prominence to the number of those who resent and denounce the ex-Colonel's inexcusable "flier," it is surprising indeed to find in the columns of so distinguished a religious journal as the interdenominational *Christian Century* an editorial like "The Forbidden Theme," in the issue of September 24.

For more than twenty-five years, I have been a consistent reader of the *Christian Century,* and I have more than once disagreed, and violently, with the opinions of its learned editor, Dr. Charles Clayton Morrison, but I have never in all these years read an editorial from the pen of this capable editor, the logic of which creaked so terribly.

It would be not only unfair but stupid to charge the *Christian Century* or its editor with anti-Semitism. Among the many fine qualities that have always characterized the general editorial policy of this outstanding journal of interdenominational Protestant opinion there have been paramount a profound sense of devotion to the spirit of tolerance and good will towards other faiths and denominations, a fine sense of sportsmanship where even fundamental differences were recognized; and nowhere have religious minorities, whether Christian or non-Christian, been more stoutly defended in the exercise and enjoyment of their natural and constitutional rights than in the editorial columns of the *Christian Century.* It is the memory of precisely this splendid journalistic record of fair play and reasonableness which makes the reader gasp as he comes upon an editorial such as "The Forbidden Theme." The reader's astonishment begins with the opening sentences of the editorial. He is bewildered at the obvious bewilderment of the learned editorial mind which seems to find itself most uncomfortably hanging upon the horns of a dilemma. But the reader fails to discover the dilemma which seems to cause the editor so much anguish.

Surely, there is no dilemma of criticizing or not criticizing Mr. Lindbergh's well-known attitude towards President Roosevelt and the current trend of American foreign policy. No one expected Dr. Morrison to do more here than to agree and to applaud. The policy of the *Christian Century* towards the course of the present administration in foreign affairs has always been consistent, and never more so than since the summer of 1939 when the *Christian Century's* editorial attitude became definitely anti-Roosevelt, non-interventionist, and decidedly pro-pacifist. This is the right and privilege of Dr. Morrison.

If anyone has in the past shown a tender conscience towards injustice of every sort and inhumanity of all kinds, it has been Dr. Morrison; that a Christian gentleman of his quality and caliber should for even a moment hesitate in forthrighly denouncing and condemning Lindbergh's vicious thrust against the patriotism and Americanism of American Jewry and that he should find it necessary to defend what has been so widely and promptly branded an outrage, gives rise to the terrible suspicion that in the writing of this particular editorial the good Doctor was not at his best.

Are we to number Dr. Morrison's fine sense of discrimination and his usual sense of balance and equity among the early war casualties? It is nothing short of painful to observe this editorial mind suddenly finding it so hard to utter a simple and direct word of censure against a violation of the canons of justice, and instead resorting to tortuous phrases and devious arguments in an attempt to exonerate Mr. Lindbergh. The strongest term of "disapproval" Dr. Morrison can find, and we doubt whether even this term is meant to carry actual disapproval, is "sadly misadvised" or a "distinct disservice." Surely, if Mr. Lindbergh has persistently damned the Jews with too faint praise, Dr. Morrison finds it very easy to praise Mr. Lindbergh and his Des Moines speech with "too faint damnation."

Throughout this entire editorial, Dr. Morrison seems to show much more sympathy for Mr. Lindbergh than for the Jews. It appears at times as though poor Mr. Lindbergh had to be protected by the *Christian Century*

against the terrible persecutions directed against him by those wicked American Jews. One reads with strange emotions the sentence: "He [Lindbergh] spoke with fine feeling and sympathy for a people who have suffered as no others have suffered at the hands of the Nazi regime." I listened to the Des Moines Lindbergh address at my radio, and if there was one thing I missed completely when the speaker referred to the Jews, it was that "fine feeling and sympathy" of which Dr. Morrison writes. Of course, it may be that his ears are more sensitive to such intonations and modulations in the Lindbergh voice than mine. What impressed *me,* was the utterly cold, impersonal, and entirely matter-of-fact voice with which these words were spoken.

The editor of the *Christian Century* then does what seems to me a very reckless thing when, in his attempt to exculpate his fellow non-interventionist, he seeks to make a scapegoat of Wendell Willkie by accusing this gentleman of "raising" the issue of anti-Semitism. We are to understand that Mr. Willkie is reprehensible for "raising" this issue, but that the shining Sir Galahad of Humanity and Americanism, Charles Lindbergh, is at the most "ill advised" for following so bad an example. Does the keen mind of Dr. Morrison really fail to see that, far from "raising" the issue of anti-Semitism at the Senate's investigation of the alleged warmongering of the moving picture industry, Mr. Willkie "recognized and faced" an issue which he and every decent American deplores, whether it be introduced into a Senate investigation or anywhere else in our life as a nation. The following paragraphs from an editorial in the *New York World-Telegram* of September 26 should make an interesting answer to Dr. Morrison's strange reasoning that Mr. Willkie did it first, so why blame Mr. Lindbergh? Incidentally, no one can charge the *World-Telegram* with being pro-Roosevelt and interventionist as regards American foreign policy:

> Some days ago Mr. Nye made certain remarks about the movie industry which appeared to us, and to others, to be a calculated attempt to incite anti-Semitic feeling against Hollywood. Along with Colonel Lindbergh, who made a blanket indictment of the Jews as warmongers, he was quickly showered with criticism. Among those who denounced the invidious references to the Jews was Wendell Willkie.
>
> Now comes Mr. Nye, neither bloody nor bowed, but full of pious indignation. It is Mr. Willkie, he says, who is guilty of raising the racial issue!
>
> Here is something new in dialectics. Under the Nye formula, not he who utters a slander but he who challenges the slanderer is the culprit. It is a conception that has the merit of originality, but it could hardly be said to make sense.

Does the editor of the *Christian Century* at all realize to what terrible methods and procedures he is lending the sanction of his pen and voice when he so easily joins in the insinuation that the "Jewishness" of the movie magnates must be held responsible, at least to a considerable degree, for their alleged warmongering? Has not this form of dialectic all the earmarks of Nazi and Fascist ideology which began its destructive campaign against other "races" by discovering that "Jewishness" was obnoxious and dangerous in government, then in economics, then in education and the other professions, then in art, and so forth, through that whole catalogue of lies and mystifying mythology with which a still non-believing world is being entertained and frightened?

There are in the editorial, "The Forbidden Theme," some excellent paragraphs revealing all the fine acumen and clear thinking of the editorial mind which can and so often does delight the reader with its disciplined logic and clear expression. These are the paragraphs in which Dr. Morrison discusses and criticizes the superficial efforts of churches and other organizations in trying to meet the problem of religious and racial prejudice in America, particularly the problem of anti-Semitism. But these splendid paragraphs only succeed in rising to a pitiful anti-climax in the closing argument where we find him stating that "religious intolerance in the United States is no menace to our peace." And pray, Mr. Editor, just what sort of intolerance *do* you consider to be a menace to our peace? Does not every high school freshman know enough to realize that any form of intolerance constitutes a menace to a democratic society and none more so than religious intolerance, precisely because it is of all intolerances the most subtle, the most subversive, and the most destructive of spirit and morale? Even in days of peace and normalcy, intolerance is a constant menace to our peace of mind and to our security as a family of people, and religious intolerance is even then a constant source of social irritation and political confusion. In days of national emergency and crisis, religious intolerance can easily become a major national problem, and it certainly does not lose its potency to threaten our national unity because a prominent religious editor declares that "religious intolerance in the United States is no menace to our peace."

Again, "the Jewish problem is not primarily a religious problem," says Dr. Morrison. And just what is the Jewish problem "primarily"? He does not say, but goes on to state that the problem "is racial or social." Not a particularly bright or original statement from one who should be more explicit. Dr. Morrison knows as well as anyone that the racial implications of anti-Semitism, whether those of a Gobineau, or of a Chamberlain, or of a Nock or others, have long been discounted and shown to be both unscientific and unreal. Those at all conversant with the problem know that it is neither "racial" nor "social" nor "economic" nor "political" nor "religious" nor any *one* single and simple thing, but rather a highly complex pattern of human reactions in which elements of politics, economics, religion, psychology, and many others mingle and form that confusing and so often baffling problem in the attempted solution of which we only make confusion worse confounded by glibly indicating a part as identical with the whole. The history of anti-Semitism shows clearly that particular circumstances tend to bring to the surface of public reaction certain elements of this complex phenomenon, and students of this tragic chapter in western civilization also know, and only too well, that the "religious motivation" plays a leading, if not *the* dominating, role in almost all outbreaks of this unreasonable and irrational prejudice.

"Today, emphatically, is no time to face this issue or to raise it," declares Dr. Morrison as the major thesis and chief conclusion of his editorial. And just *when* is the time to face such an issue? Dr. Morrison knows as well as anyone that this issue has not been "raised" in the sense in which he and the champions of "America First" understand this word. It has not been "raised" by either the Jews of America or by anyone else of responsibility. It has always been "raised" by unscrupulous demagogues, by conscienceless churchmen, by crooked politicians, and by heartless and heedless rogues

who felt that the red herring of *Jewishness* "decorates" the trail of every prejudice. And the issue has always been "recognized" by intelligent and responsible men and women, because only by recognizing and fighting it can its evil consequences and its vicious implications be overcome and rendered harmless. Mr. Willkie has bravely "faced" this issue, and he is in good company. Mr. Lindbergh has shamefully abused and distorted the issue, and I am deeply disturbed to think that the editor of the *Christian Century* would for a moment be counted in such company.

I find it very difficult to understand how a man of the intellectual acumen and the spiritual integrity of Dr. Morrison can argue for a "hush" policy towards the issue of anti-Semitism when the time for silence and passive tolerance of this menace has long passed, if it has ever existed. Just when is such an issue to be faced, I repeat? And Dr. Morrison knows the answer as well and better than I do, for it is very simply this: Any issue which involves as does anti-Semitism the very fundamentals of our national life must be faced whenever and wherever it is recognized; anti-Semitism and all kindred issues involving mass irritations and social tensions based on differences of cultural, religious, political, and other mores cannot be left to solve themselves; sociologists and psychologists may vary as to the particular treatment of the issue at a particular time, but all responsible authorities will agree that times of crisis and days of emergency with the stress and strain they entail are decidedly *not* the time when important issues of popular morale can be neglected or hushed up; that anti-Semitism has been a *bete noir* of western civilization cannot be gainsaid; that it has never been effectively challenged by attempts to ignore and hush it, is obvious, and that today such a policy of putting a quietus upon its discussion would only aggravate the evil, is also plainly evident—and it comes with poor grace indeed from a religious editor, from one who would angrily resent any attempts to hush discussion of other highly controversial national and international problems, to write that anti-Semitism should not be even discussed until, as he says, "reason resumes again her now vacant throne."

Anti-Semitism, always a monster bred by fear, ignorance, and superstition, cannot be left to thrive and prosper in the dark places of silence and cowardice; it must be dragged out into the light of reason. Its appeals to violence and mob-passion must be met with calm reference to those nobler and finer impulses of the human spirit which never, not even in times of national hysteria, are entirely impotent and helpless.

Does Dr. Morrison want to say that because we have failed to combat anti-Semitism and kindred prejudices effectively in days of peace and security we should do nothing about them now? Is this the counsel of wisdom and valor, or the voice of despair and cowardice? Would an intelligent person argue that because not enough has been done by society to prevent crime, it should not resort to police protection when a crime wave breaks out, or that the fire apparatus should not be called out because human carelessness has caused the conflagration?

Indeed, in order to face the issues, recognized by every intelligent and conscientious American today as looming large in their threat to our unity and security, with calm mind and resolute spirit, to recognize them for what they are and their ominous champions for their dishonesty and un-Americanism, to do that today when the national mind is inflamed and people are blinded by passion and prejudice, this is no easy thing; but the duty remains, and brave men and women will not shirk it. Anti-Semitism remains an issue that must be met; to distort it as Lindbergh does, to hush it, as Dr. Morrison advises, is neither Christian nor American. The Lindbergh or the Morrison way may be the easiest way out, but it is certain to lead to disaster.

The Study Table

Testing Ground of the Good Neighbor Policy

GOOD NEIGHBORS. *By Hubert Herring. New Haven: Yale University Press. 381 pp. $3.00.*

In a day when the trends in Latin America are being closely followed, the publication of an authoritative volume is timely. Observers of Western Hemisphere affairs will agree, after reading this book, that seldom has a more profound analytical study been available.

Primarily dealing with Argentine, Brazil and Chile, it is more than the A B C of the vast continent. It includes all, even the X Y Z of Colombia, Costa Rica, and Mexico. Anything from the prolific pen of Hubert Herring about Mexico is a reminder of the Seminars he has conducted in that country during the past twenty years, Seminars that have become a national institution, proving attractive to tourist, statesman, and educator alike. For fifteen years Dr. Herring has served as director of the Committee for Cultural Relations with Latin America.

The book primarily asks the question: "What will happen in South Ameria whether Hitler wins or loses?" It suggests the possibilities for western unity when 260 millions of people in twenty-one republics are in free and loyal alliance. With more than an economic stake in South America, the United States faces an opportunity for wise diplomacy. The author gives a clarion call of warning lest the overtures of the United States be so misguided as to arouse fears of American imperialism. Here is a typical paragraph from the closing chapter:

> The doctrine of the Good Neighbor, most admirable creation of American diplomacy, now faces the testing ground. Alien broils, feared by Monroe, overtake the Americas. Can twenty-one nations of such disparate cultures and economies find common cause in defense of their several sovereignties? Can twenty-one nations persuade one another to discipline the agents of disruption within their various boundaries? Can wise diplomacy outrun disorder? These questions concern each nation from Salvador to Brazil. Meanwhile the people of the United States pose a question of equal import: Can we resist the prophets of rosy dawn who would have us assume the role of arbiter of another 130 million Americans? Can we keep our heads when the American Rudyard Kiplings sound the new call to crusade, again offering the white man's burden? The answer is locked in the pages of a history which flows too swiftly for the comfort of mortal man.

This reviewer entertains the hope that South Americans will read this book. It will strengthen their confidence as much as it will enlighten us.

ROBERT MURRAY PRATT.

Correspondence

Mr. Collier to Mr. Reese

To UNITY:

War is based on nationalism, and when one supports nationalism he is supporting a condition which makes for war. If all the nations would commit suicide, as nations, the peoples of the world might be better off!

Are we to let Adolf Hitler set our standards? He has persecuted the Jews. Are we to persecute the whole German people? Or perhaps I am being harsh. We are not persecuting them—we are just killing them. And the blockade: we are not persecuting the entire continent of Europe—we are just starving off a few million innocent women and children.

Ah, Mr. Reese, if you want war, your editorial is right. But the more you fight, the more war you have; and the more war you have, the less peace you have.

There are some people foolish enough to believe that the way to get peace is to quit fighting. "Ah," but you say, in your physical fear, "if I don't fight, Adolf will kill me." Well, say these peace workers, it is better to die while standing up for the right, than to live fearfully while fighting for something known to be wrong.

Cowards, these pacifists? They may be. If they are, you are right. Go on and be a Hitler yourself. Maybe you would rather be a live Hitler than a dead pacifist.

But, in thinking of your physical self, bear in mind that the expectancy of a pacifist, under modern war conditions, is just about as great as the expectancy of other people. (Nonviolent resistance is the only resistance possibile under modern war conditions anyway.) I doubt that this consideration has much influence with most pacifists, but it might have some weight upon people who put so much stress upon such matters.

But I will say this: If you are sincere, stick by your guns. You have a right to express what you believe to be the truth. I would stand up for the right of the devil himself to air his views, although I would not necessarily support the views he put forward.

OLIVER B. COLLIER.

Detroit, Michigan.

All Are Guilty

To UNITY:

I wonder why Mr. Holmes is so acrimonious in his opposition to war; he is as belligerent in the tone and manner of his writings as Claude Pepper or Secretary Knox, and at times just as illogical as they are, or nearly so. For instance, I do not see how he has the right to quote an army man who tells how easy it is to defend our shores. If we defend, we fight; and it is just as bad to fight in our own country as it is anywhere else. If he believes in the use of violence to defend our country, it seems to me that the logical or best way to do it would be to fight when we have others to help us, and certainly away from our own homes rather than bring destruction and misery among our own.

In his comment in the October number, which is divided into six sections, four of them are vituperation mostly, at times appeals to prejudice. The third section is a statement of principles which I think are sound, but somehow the taste of the preceding sections seems to carry over into it. In his sixth section his story about Bishop Paul Jones is really efficient pacifist propaganda. If the description is correct I wish I could have met the bishop. The nearest approach to that sort of man that I ever met was Eugene V. Debs, a loving and lovable man, but like many another popular speaker he was vain, susceptible to flattery, not free from egotism, and had a desire to get ahead of any who obstructed his way.

But my main reason for criticizing Mr. Holmes and his bitter style, is because he, as well as all the rest of us, is an active participant in the mode of life that has produced the terrible suffering and warfare that is now going on in the world on a scale never before known. I do not mean the blanket charge that "we have done those things that we ought not to have done"; I mean that he and the rest of us are daily pursuing that particular course of conduct that has always produced wars, and on that basis and until we stop that course of conduct we have no right to criticize those who war, because we are ourselves at war.

Everybody tries to "get ahead," there is no one who is free from this urge, and few there are who even consider the fact that if they "get ahead" others are left behind, and, alas, still fewer who protest or struggle against it. This is the basic principle from which grow resentments, ambitions and hates, with all the combinations of these emotions which produce war. This great evil springs from the primal urge of early homo sapiens to take by force or cunning, what labor, skill, or luck had enabled his fellow to obtain from natural resources. This spirit of grab has persisted ever since, and today, with our complicated relations among men, although we rarely attempt it by primitive methods on a personal scale, the biologic urge to grab is still with us and is carried on by various means, such as rent, interest, profit, personal magnetism, salesmanship, eloquence, and other less prominent means of "getting ahead." These and all sorts of combinations are the modern technical methods of letting "the devil take the hindmost."

This is the principle under which men combine with others so that they may increase their lead over larger numbers of their fellows, and this sort of thing grows from local combines to national organizations, and from national to international, all to get ahead of, or push back more and more of their fellows, forgetting that their real good is irrevocably tied up with the good of all men.

Wars will continue to increase in the future as they have in the past in both the extent of the numbers involved and the physical force and speed used, in other words in the scope of their destructivenesss, until the race is nearly destroyed, unless some form of intellectual ability succeeds in convincing the people that men's interests are concurrent not divergent or opposed; that the way to "get ahead" and stay ahead, is to push no one back.

Because we are doing the same thing, only in varying degree, as Roosevelt, Churchill, and Hitler, trying to "get ahead" to the full extent of our ability, therefore we are guilty just as they are. Carlyle says: "All men must toil or steal, by whatever name they call their stealings." I believe that all your fulminations against war are wasted breath or ink, until we give correct names to our stealings and determine to quit them. I wonder if it is too late.

R. W. HARRISON.

Coral Gables, Florida.

Hitler Must Be Stopped

To UNITY:

Is our democracy under no obligation to help free the subjected countries of western Europe? It is well known that most if not all of these did their utmost to maintain their neutrality; yet there seems now little prospect that they will regain their freedom except through powerful aid from us. I wish our isolationist friends who seem to think our entrance into the war would be criminal, would give a frank answer to the above question.

Most of these countries have reached a fairly high state of civilization, and their labor unions and coöperative organizations had brought to the masses conditions of well-being that are all too rare. Denmark, for example, although poor in natural resources, was said to enjoy as satisfactory labor conditions as are found in any country. It will be a loss to the world if these progressive peoples are to be held for a long period in a state of degradation that will rob them of their culture as well as their economic well-being.

The isolationists say we can best serve mankind by setting an example of a workable democracy. That is very well so long as the example is set before people who are free to copy it. But no example however good can benefit people reduced to slavery and penury. And such a condition seems to be the fate in store for the inhabitants of most of the world unless Hitler's ambitions are curbed.

What then is the duty of a people as fortunately situated as we? First, let us repeal our neutrality legislation which no longer is consistent with the national policy which we adopted through enactment of the Lend-Lease Bill. To retain the neutrality legislation now makes us hypocrites in the eyes of the world.

It is true that full participation in the war does not at present seem necessary or advisable, because countries now fighting Hitler are in greater need of equipment than of men. If we declared war, the flow of our materials to Europe would undoubtedly be checked by our effort to arm ourselves fully—a result that at this time would be unfortunate. But the logic of our decision to give aid against Hitler will call for our full participation if that should be needed. In spite of the results from polls asking if we want to engage in war, the deep sentiment among Americans obviously is that Hitler,

by attacking and looting countries right and left, has become such a menace to the peaceful progress of mankind that he must be stopped with whatever help from us is needed.

F. S. KINDER.

Denver, Colorado.

Dark Thoughts for Hitler

TO UNITY:

Despite the foul crimes for which he is responsible, despite his grim record of brutality and terrorism almost without parallel in history, and despite all the suffering he has brought to millions, there are times when I feel almost sorry for Adolf Hitler.

For what dark thoughts must be in his mind as he lies awake in the blackness of night? Is it not possible that he may feel some small trace of remorse, some faint stirrings of a long-dormant conscience? Is it not possible that he may sometimes wish to be like other men, to have true friends, a family life, and peace of mind?

But it would be futile for him to have such thoughts, for he chose long ago the path he wanted to follow, and he has gone too far along that path to turn back. He must go on to the bitter end. No one who has once set forth on the road of conquest can ever again hope to have true friends or family life. No one who has caused tons of bombs to be dropped on helpless women and children can ever hope to have peace of mind, either in this world or the next.

And as he looks ahead, what must he see? For him there are but three alternatives: to die as Ceasar did, at the hands of a vengeful assassin; to die as Napoleon did, in exile, friendless and alone; or to die by his own hand.

The late Kaiser Wilhelm could have told Hitler where the path of conquest leads. He could have told him that no greater fallacy ever entered a man's mind than the illusion that there can be any final and lasting victory in a war of conquest. He could have told him that "the paths of glory lead but to the grave," and that before the grave there must be remorse and sorrow. He could have told him that but one destiny awaits a man of conquest, and that that destiny is to be scorned and hated by all decent men.

He could have told Hitler many things, but Hitler would not have listened. He would not have listened because the dream of world conquest is one that will burn in the hearts of some men in every generation, and it will burn there until the day comes that witnesses the crumbling of their fond hopes, and until they realize that, though they deemed themselves mighty in power, there is another power still greater.

Hitler may deny that God exists, he may scoff at all religion, but for all his vainglorious boastings and for all his proud words, he cannot alter the inexorable laws of God in the slightest degree, nor can he escape the certain retribution that awaits him.

For a day will come when the people whom he has enslaved and tortured will rise against him. They will rise from the ashes of their humiliation, they will rise in all their power and their glory, and like a resistless fire, like a raging flood, like a destroying wind, they will overthrow his regime. For no regime that is not founded on truth, justice, and tolerance can long withstand the flaming anger of outraged humanity.

ROGER E. WARNER.

Chester Depot, Vermont.

In Defense of Lindbergh

TO UNITY:

Having been a subscriber of UNITY for over twenty-five years, I have for the first time, in the October issue, read an article that strikes me as repulsive and unworthy of a place in your journal, dedicated to high thinking and moral purposes.

This writer of the "Lindbergh Ghost Stories," offers no constructive criticism. He breathes only malediction and hatred toward a group of people to whom he gives the name of one of our outstanding peacetime heroes.

He purports to tell what this group thinks and says (without quotation marks, I notice) as if we had not heard these men on the platform and radio, and read their non-intervention speeches in the daily press.

In his version, I recognize nothing of their ideas or their spirit.

Mr. Perlman not only distorts their message out of all likeness to reality, but shows not an atom of the tolerance or understanding which he craves for himself and descends to unspeakable depths in name-calling.

Take for instance the following:

> Can you not see that the Lindberghs are trying to find in your beings, reservoirs of hate which they can inflame for their own evil ends?
>
> Do you not see that they are trying to lead you into acts of unrighteousness so that in the confusion they may destroy your democratic rights and substitute the dictatorial form of government instead?
>
> Do you not see that behind their mask of high virtue is the ugly face of intolerance, and so forth?

This man has evidently read into one of Colonel Lindbergh's speeches, something that was not there—he has himself seen a "ghost."

But that UNITY should give space to his ravings, is *astonishing* to say the least.

ELNORE T. GUEST.

Silver Creek, New York.

A CHRISTMAS GIFT

A Subscription to UNITY is a suitable Christmas Gift for a Friend

1 year for $1.50

Abraham Lincoln Centre
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois

For the enclosed $1.50, send UNITY as a Christmas Gift to:

Name ..... **Street** .....

City ..... **State** .....